Griscom Morgan

Rt. 1, Box 275
Yellow Springs,
Ohio 45387

August 1, 1970

Dear Hal:

It looks as though I am pestering you with letters. But I feel the imperative of getting your work published before more assassinations make things more hopeless. And as you appear to be winding up at least the basic docum ent you want published, however impossible you may think its publication to be, I want to give some more views on what that document needs to be and do.

The ten thousand dollars and the length I do not regard as insuperable. But the document itself I feel has handicaps that would make it inaffectual for now, serving more as a documentation of what happened for historians if there were any living dedades or centuries hence -- and the small circle of people who will read.

What I would like to see added to what you have is what many reviewers of assassination literature have criticized it fof not having, which is a brief resume of the evidence as it shapes up to a picture that makes sense, and which would be supported by the great documentation and detailed story as you give it. Again and again I have found this resume needed -- and effective with people who do not have the time to devote to reading and study in an area about which they are not convinced they should investigate. For example, a historian particularly versed in the affairs of South East Asia and Americas involvement there was teaching about the sequence of developments in the Vietnam war. I challenged his statement that the Kennedy's would have followed the same course as Johnson. He is a vigorous and capable man. He was at first incredulous and antagonistic to the to him inconclusive and voluminous literature which had left him with no clear idea about the assassinat on. When I showed him the brief documentation and summary of the case I had assembled for such a purpose he was deeply impressed. I did the same with the American editor of the Christian Science Monitor and he was co nvinced to the point that he sent a man to see Garrison, and from then his endeavor failed.

In such a beginning of your book I would like to see hard factual material free from accusations and verbage attacking people. For example, you did not answer Sparrow in your discussion of him, but only attacked him and the way his material had gotten presented to the public. In my brief statement on Sparrow I picked out the only statement of his position that had any meat in it and used it to make a stronger point about the evidence. Like Jui Jitsu I used the opponant's own arguments to destroy the opponant's position and make my case, and did not need to use verbal invective against him -- which would have been a waste of words, and for such a brief overview of the case I had to economize in words to the very limit possible. Similarly in the statement I wrote leading off with Vince's evidence from the Zapruder movie I used a quotation from Lewis's The Scavengers to prove my point against Lewis. Without Lewis it would be less convincing. This involved no waste of words against Lewis. There is place for invective and all that, but in an introductory overview that the public needs such economy is crucial. A primary enemy is the reader's and the revewer's being surfeited with books and words, and careful reading has largely ceased to exist. Your bulk of words augment the problem even though your detailed treatment has its value. You need to get past that obstacle. That is why I see as

important such an introductory survey and some means such as I suggested of helping the reader skim or skip throughthe bulk of the material to get an edited version without having to eliminate most of the detailed treatment for the reader who desired to read in greater detail. You did not comment on my suggestion that such editing be established in the margin. I would not worry much as to just which portions were marked for cursory reading, as that there be some means of directing the more harried and hurried reader how to get through the material if he has limited time.

Conceivably a summary of the case could be in the conclusion rather than in the beginning. But I feel that the beginning needs some of this other kind of treatment that will do a job for the critical but time-poor reader.

Some months ago I spoke to Marcus Raskin of the Institute of Policy Studies about the assassinations. He mentioned that you had written him asking for help to keep some work on the assassination from being published. Is there a possibility that I could approach Raskin for help? Some of the Antioch students have wealth and I might find if any of them could tap sourses that would help. I see real problems in this, and suppose that only an some rare instances should it be followed up. One such instance is a student I particularly trust and value who has offered to help us find financing for our organization Community Service, Inc.

So much for now.

Best wishes,

Gris

Griscom Morgan

P.S. I have a clipping of May 1968 by Carl Rowan telling in effect of "leaks" from the FBI and CIA that they suspect the black nationalists and red China and Cuba of the King assassination. That is comparable to the leaks associating Cuba with the JFK assassination, now pushed further by one of the most recent books on the subject. All this when the FBI knew the real source or suspects of the assassinations -- you can document briefly and without editorializing in the first of the book succinctly to make the case. Well, and another suggestion, we might be able to get some able young history students under an able Antioch history prof I trust to work on something for you -- as a fellow who has independent means.